



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

REVIEWS AND MISCELLANY.

NOTES ON FOREIGN CENSUSES.

The French Census of March 24, 1901, the results of which were published in August, shows a total population of 38,641,333, an increase of 412,364 since 1896, or about one per cent. Although this is a higher rate of increase than that between 1886 and 1896, it is so low as to cause considerable anxiety to French publicists. Paul Leroy-Beaulieu analyzes some of the census results in *L'Economiste Français* (July 6, 1901, p. 11, and August 24, 1901, p. 262), and incidentally criticises severely several details in the practical taking of the census. He points out that the slight improvement as compared with the period prior to 1896 was to be expected on account of a reduction in mortality due partly to a decreased prevalence of influenza and also on account of unusually good industrial conditions, including the exemption of the wine industry from the attacks of the Phylloxera. Of the 87 departments, only 28 have increased in population during the last five years. That of the Seine alone has gained 289,662, or nearly three-fourths of the total gain for the nation; this represents an increase of almost 9 per cent. The other departments which show a growth in population are almost all on the frontiers, the most marked increase being along the Mediterranean. In all cases the cities, for example, Marseilles, Nice and Toulon, exhibit the greatest gains. Only four of the departments in the interior have held their own in population; and in the richest regions of Normandy, Gascony and Burgundy, a general and, in some cases, very startling decrease is manifest. While the population of France since 1850 has only increased by 3,340,000, that of Italy has gained nearly 9 millions, that of Great Britain more than 14 millions, that of Austria-Hungary the same, that of Germany 21 millions, and that of Russia 62 millions. M. Leroy-Beaulieu dwells upon the immigration, which is already beginning, from adjoining

territories, as an evil; and advises checking the decrease of native population by reducing the French death-rate through sanitary precautions and by increasing the birth-rate through favors and exemption granted to families with three or more children. The reduction of the death-rate is, no doubt, possible; the other part of the program seems less practical. To an outsider, (see editorial in the *Economist* for June 22, 1901), it seems, in the first place, that the conditions existing in France are not unmixed evils, as a small population may be made a very efficient one both in a commercial and a military sense by intelligent training; and, in the second place, that an increase of population by immigration need not necessarily be deplored.

The decrease in the rural population of France is discussed at some length by Emile Chevallier in *L'Economiste Français* for June 8 and June 15, 1901 (p. 806 and p. 846). The proportion of the population living in towns of less than 2000 inhabitants has fallen, during the period 1846-96, from 75.6 per cent to 60.9 per cent. Individual districts have lost one-third, or even one-half, of their population during that period. This is not due, as in other countries, simply to emigration toward the industrial centres, but largely to a decreased birth-rate. In many towns the deaths during recent years have greatly exceeded the births, in some cases, by one hundred per cent. The birth-rate per one hundred inhabitants in one district was 3.4 in 1799 and 1.7 in 1899; in another district it was 3.3 in 1800 and 1.4 in the period 1896-98, etc. The cause of these phenomena is, of course, the exaggerated prudence and ambition of the small cultivator, leading him to limit his family in order that his children may be prosperous. In one district, in particular, it is noted that "the fathers and mothers of large families are turned to ridicule." Emigration to the cities has also, of course, played an important part in the depopulation of the rural districts. The following table shows the increasing number of such emigrants from one commune:

<i>Period.</i>	<i>Males.</i>	<i>Females.</i>
1844-50	1	3
1850-60	19	18
1860-70	16	6
1870-80	20	13
1880-90	20	13
1890-99	27	25

M. Chevallier points out the relation of the movement of population to the introduction of railways, to the inoculation of the young farmers with the virus of town life during the enforced period of military service, and, in particular, to the improvements in agricultural machinery, which have driven many of the laborers out of employment.

The decennial census of Great Britain and Ireland was taken on March 31, 1901, or just one week after the French census; and its results are much more encouraging than are those of the latter. It shows a total population for the United Kingdom of 41,454,219, against 37,731,922 in 1891, a gain of about 10 per cent. In England and Wales, alone, the growth is still more striking, as is shown by the following figures:

	Population 1891.	Population 1901.
England and Wales,	22,002,525	32,525,716
Scotland,	4,025,647	4,471,957
Ireland,	4,703,750	4,456,546

While England and Wales have increased by about 12 per cent, and Scotland by about 11 per cent, Ireland has lost more than 5 per cent of its population. The rate of increase for England and Wales is slightly greater than that of the previous decade (12.15 against 11.65 per cent.) In a valuable review by Edwin Cannan (*The Economic Review*, XI, 1901, p. 358), it is pointed out that, while the excess of births over deaths was somewhat less between 1891 and 1901 than in the previous decade, the net loss by excess of emigration over immigration was diminished in a greater degree, having fallen in the United Kingdom from 1,556,803 to 589,887. In England and Wales the net loss in the ten years by emigration is only 70,003, and as the emigrants include some 150,000 troops in South Africa, it appears that this portion of Great Britain has actually been colonized rather than colonizing. Ireland, on the other hand, has lost heavily by emigration, though much less heavily than in the previous decade; her proportion of 32.6 per cent of the population of the United Kingdom in 1801 has fallen to 10.8 per cent. M. Leroy-Beaulieu in *L'Economiste Français* July 20, 1901, makes the decrease of the population of Ireland from 8,000,000 to 4,500,000 in sixty years the text for a vehement and not unde-

served phillippic against the social and political régime under which it has occurred. In all parts of the United Kingdom the tendency to urban concentration of the population is shown with great distinctness. While the increase in the rural population of England and Wales is only 2.9 per cent, that of the urban districts is 15.2; and Cannan believes that if town outskirts and suburbs were excluded from the first class an actual decrease would be shown. The population of greater London has increased 17 per cent, reaching 6,578,00, or more than one-fifth of the total for England and Wales. Even in Ireland, Dublin and Belfast have increased by 7.9 per cent and 27.8 per cent respectively; and in Scotland, the county of Lanark, including the city of Glasgow, has gained 232,000 persons, more than half the total increase for that Kingdom. In general, the seaport and railway works towns show handsome gains, while the cotton and woolen districts in the north of England have grown but slowly. An extraordinary mistake was made in the first published results of the census in the table showing the per cent of increase in urban districts of various sizes. Instead of comparing the same towns at the two periods, 15 towns having between 100,000 and 250,000 population in 1891 were compared with 24 towns of the same size in 1901, giving a rate of increase of 44.61. A corrected table was published later, from which the following is extracted :

Urban Districts with Population of	Number of Districts.	Mean Percentage Increase 1891-1901.
250,000 and upward.....	9	9.32
100,000-250,000.....	24	17.74
50,000-100,000.....	42	23.15
20,000-50,000.....	141	20.37
10,000-20,000.....	219	18.44
3,000-10,000.....	472	12.40
Under 3,000.....	215	4.60

The German census, taken December 1, 1900, gives a population of 56,345,014, an increase of 7.78 per cent since 1895, the highest rate yet recorded. Berlin has now 1,884,151 inhabitants, an increase of 11.6 in the quinquennial period. The growth of the population is due to the high birth rate (37.1 per thousand for the three years

1894-96), and to the decreasing death rate (30.62 in 1872, 22.9 in 1894-96). The excess of births over deaths is greater than in any European country except Russia.

A valuable paper by J. A. Baines in the *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, vol. LXIV, 1901, p. 493, contains reviews of all the recent censuses. The author notes the lessening rate of increase of population, both in the new and the old world. The mean decennial rate for the first half of the nineteenth century was 15.05 in England and Wales, and that for the second half only 12.66. In the United States the corresponding figures are 34.3 and 26.7. Mr. Baines suggests the correlation of the comparatively low rate of increase in the United States between 1890 and 1900, which was only 20.7, with the decreased emigration noticed above in connection with the English census and also indicated by returns from Germany and Sweden. In Mexico the new census shows an increase of 7.2 per cent in the country at large; the capital has increased by 13 per cent; but otherwise the smaller districts show the greater gains. The Canadian census for 1901 shows a population of 5,338,883, an increase of only 10.46 against 11.75 for the previous decennium, and 18.75 from 1871 to 1881. The lessened increase in 1891 has been attributed to the fact that in that year, for the first time, the rule prevailed that persons who had been out of the country for a year or more should not be enumerated. The 1891-1901 increase in Lower Canada was small, 5.2 per cent, and in the Atlantic seaboard districts only 1.4 per cent, while the Northwest and Pacific coast region shows an increase of 87.7 per cent. The Government estimate of immigration into Canada during the decennium is 500,000, about equal to the increase in population. It therefore appears that the normal growth of population by the excess of births over deaths has been just neutralized; and the balancing force must have been a slow filtering of the Canadian population across the border into the United States. In reviewing the German census, Mr. Baines points out that, while France has had an annual increase of 23 per ten thousand during the last twenty-nine years, Germany has a corresponding figure of 110; furthermore, the German rate has steadily risen since 1880. Prussia now contains 61.17 per cent of the total population; Bavaria 10.96; and Saxony, 7.45.

The towns of over 100,000 inhabitants contained, in 1900, 16.17 per cent of the total population, and their increase between 1895 and 1900 was 17.7 per cent. The Italian census of February, 1901, is the first since 1881, and shows strikingly the error introduced into vital statistics by basing estimates of population on infrequent enumerations. The estimate for the whole Kingdom based on the growth between 1871 and 1881 was within 1.2 per cent of the actual value, but in the smaller districts divergencies of 6 to 12 per cent occurred. In Tuscany the estimate was 8.6 too low; in Florence 12 per cent too low; in Rome 9.6 too high. The increase of the whole population since 1881 has been 14.02 per cent against 7.13 per cent between 1861 and 1871, and 6.19 per cent between 1871 and 1881. The greatest gains are in the inland cities, Rome having grown by 54 per cent and Milan by 53 per cent. The seaport towns have increased less rapidly. In spite of the drain of emigration (308,000 persons in 1899), only one district in Italy, the Basilicata, shows a decrease in population since 1881.

Austria and Hungary exhibit percentage rates of increase of 9.3 and 9.6 respectively during the last decade, and in both countries a large increase in population due to a rapidly declining death-rate has been partly balanced by an increase in immigration. In Switzerland, the census of 1900 shows the same fall in the death-rate. While the birth-rate fell only from 3.09 in the period, 1870-80, to 2.86 in the period 1888-1900, the respective figures for the death-rate were 2.36 and 1.96. The population of the nine large Swiss towns has increased by 63 per cent during the last twenty years, while the rate for the whole country has been only 16.9. The census of 1899 in the Netherlands furnishes some interesting figures on sex distribution; the excess of females in the smaller towns, under 20,000 inhabitants, has fallen from 18 per mille in 1830 to a deficiency of 1, while in the whole country the excess has fallen from 40 to 25. In Sweden the proportion of females to males had fallen to 1049 to 1000 in 1900, while the figures between 1850 and 1890 ranged between 1065 and 1061, and at the beginning of the census studies in 1750 the ratio was as high as 1129. The Norwegian population has increased during the last ten years at a rate of 1.10 per cent per annum, considerably above the Swedish rate of .71 per cent. The large towns of Norway show an especially rapid

increase, the rate for the last ten years being 30.5 per cent for the urban, and 5.5 per cent for the rural population. The results of the Danish census of February, 1901, coincide with those of the other countries considered; they show an accelerated increase in population due on the one hand to a growing excess of births over deaths, and due, geographically analyzed, to great growth of the towns, and especially of those of medium size.

C.-E. A. WINSLOW.

NOTES ON VITAL STATISTICS OF AMERICAN CITIES.

The *Annual Report of the Board of Health of Manchester* (N. H.) for 1900 illustrates the importance of correct estimates of population in calculating death-rates. The estimated population for 1896 was 56,000, with a death-rate of 18.77. In the next three years the population was estimated at 60,000, which, with a slight actual decrease in total deaths, brought the rates down to 16.97, 16.68 and 17.80. In 1900 the population was found to be 56,987 and the death-rate jumped to 20.47. The ratio of deaths of children under five years to the total deaths is interesting, showing a progressive decrease between 1897 and 1900 of 61.98, 52.04, 50.65 and 48.07. The table of cases of, and deaths from, zymotic diseases shows, apparently, unusual success in securing reports of measles and scarlet fever. There were 762 cases of measles with 5 deaths in 1899, and 827 cases with one death in 1900. On the other hand, 46 cases of diphtheria and membranous croup with 13 deaths indicates either poor reporting of cases or neglect of antitoxin treatment. The separation of these diseases (diphtheria and membranous croup), in the table, and the summation of all the zymotic diseases are misleading.

The *Annual Report of the Board of Health of Worcester* (Mass), for 1900 contain some good anti-toxin statistics, as will be seen from the following table extracted from that on page 10 of the report.